Locking of accessible information and implications for the security of quantum cryptography

Robert König* and Renato Renner†
Centre for Quantum Computation
University of Cambridge
United Kingdom

Andor Bariska‡ and Ueli Maurer§
Institute of Theoretical Computer Science
ETH Zurich
Switzerland

arXiv:quant-ph/0512021v2 11 Jan 2006

The unconditional security of a quantum key distribution protocol is often defined in terms of the *accessible information*, that is, the maximum mutual information between the distributed key S and the outcome of an optimal measurement on the adversary's (quantum) system. We show that, even if this quantity is small, certain parts of the key S might still be completely insecure when S is used in applications, such as for one-time pad encryption. This flaw is due to a *locking* property of the accessible information: one additional (physical) bit of information might increase the accessible information by more than one bit.

PACS numbers: 03.67.-a,03.67.Dd

I. SECRECY IN CLASSICAL AND QUANTUM CRYPTOGRAPHY

Secret keys play an important role in cryptography. They are used for various tasks such as the encryption or authentication of messages. Clearly, the security of these cryptographic tasks strongly depends on the *level of secrecy* of the underlying key.

The strongest and thus most desirable notion of security for a secret key S is called *perfect security* and is characterized by two conditions:

(i) any value of S is equally likely (i.e., the distribution P_S is uniform on a *key space* $\mathcal{S}$);

(ii) an adversary has no information on S (i.e., the state of any system controlled by an adversary is independent of the value of S).

Such a perfectly secure key allows for the realization of highly secure cryptographic schemes. For example, if S is used as a one-time pad [18] to encrypt a message M, the resulting ciphertext C is independent of M and thus completely useless for an adversary.

It turns out, however, that—even with the help of quantum mechanics—it is generally impossible to generate perfectly secure keys. One thus usually considers slightly weakened security definitions. For example, condition (ii) might be substituted by a bound on the information that the adversary has on S. This, however, raises questions such as: What is an appropriate measure to quantify the adversary's information on S? How to choose the upper bound on this information such that it is guaranteed that S can safely be used in applications?

In the context of *classical information-theoretic cryptography* [19], the adversary's knowledge on a key S is most generally characterised by a classical random variable Z. An n-bit key S is then said to be secure [20] if, for some small $\varepsilon \geq 0$,

$$H(S) \geq n - \varepsilon \tag{1}$$

$$I(S;Z) \leq \varepsilon \tag{2}$$

where $H(S)$ denotes the *Shannon entropy* of S and $I(S;Z) := H(S) - H(S|Z)$ is the *mutual information between* S and Z. Inequality (1) implies that S is almost uniformly distributed; it is thus an approximation of condition (i) above. Similarly, (2) is an approximation of (ii).

In *quantum cryptography* the knowledge of an adversary on a (classical) key S is described by the state of a quantum system E instead of a classical random variable Z. Accordingly, the mutual information occurring in criterion (2) is thus usually generalised to the *accessible information* $I_{\mathrm{acc}}(S;E)$, which is defined as the mutual information between S and the outcome Z of an optimal measurement applied to E (see Section II for a formal definition). The quantum version of (2) then reads

$$I_{\mathrm{acc}}(S;E) \leq \varepsilon \ . \tag{2'}$$

Inequality (2′) seems to be a natural formalisation of the requirement that an adversary has almost no information on S and is in fact commonly used in the standard literature on quantum cryptography and, in particular, quantum key distribution [21]. However, as we shall see, it is generally not sufficient to guarantee secrecy.

*Electronic address: r.t.koenig@damtp.cam.ac.uk
†Electronic address: r.renner@damtp.cam.ac.uk
‡Electronic address: andor.m.bariska@weiss.ch
§Electronic address: maurer@inf.ethz.ch

The remaining part of the paper is organized as follows. In Section II, we review the definition of accessible information and its locking property. Section III is devoted to an explicit example of locking of the accessible information. This example is then used in Section IV to show that, even if the accessible information of an adversary on the key S is arbitrarily small, S might still be insecure for certain applications. Finally, in Section V, we discuss an alternative security definition which overcomes this problem.

II. LOCKING OF ACCESSIBLE INFORMATION

Let E be a quantum system whose state depends on the value of a classical random variable V. This situation may be described using the so-called *enlarged Hilbert space representation* by encoding the random variable V into a quantum system with respect to an orthonormal basis $\{|v\rangle\}_{v\in\mathcal{V}}$ as follows:

$$\rho_{VE} := \sum_{v\in\mathcal{V}} P_V(v)\ |v\rangle\langle v| \otimes \rho_{E|V=v}\ ,$$

where $\rho_{E|V=v}$ is the state of E conditioned on $V=v$. We will refer to a state of this form as a $\{cq\}$*-state*. We will also use generalisations of this convention to triparite systems with two classical parts and call the corresponding states $\{ccq\}$*-states*.

For any $\{cq\}$-state ρ_{VE}, the *accessible information* (of E on V) is defined as [22]

$$I_{\mathrm{acc}}(V;E) := \max_{\mathcal{M}} I(V;Z)$$

where the maximum is over all local POVMs $\mathcal{M}$ on E and where $I(V;Z)$ denotes the mutual information between V and the measurement outcome Z. The accessible information $I_{\mathrm{acc}}(V;E)$ thus quantifies the amount of information on the classical value V that can be obtained by an optimal measurement applied to the quantum system E.

Consider now an extended setting involving an additional random variable Y, that is, the situation is described by a $\{ccq\}$-state ρ_{VYE}. Let [23]

$$\Delta := I_{\mathrm{acc}}(V;YE) - I_{\mathrm{acc}}(V;E)$$

be the amount by which the accessible information on V increases when Y is appended to E. The quantity Δ thus measures by how much the knowledge on V increases if one learns Y (given access to the quantum system E). Interestingly, Δ can generally be larger than the *size* of Y, i.e., the number of bits which are needed to represent its value. This phenomenon is known as *locking* [1] and will be the main topic of the next section. It should be emphasized that locking is a purely non-classical property. In fact, if the quantum system E is substituted by a classical random variable Z, we have $\Delta = I(V;Y|Z) \leq H(Y)$ [24], that is, Δ cannot be larger than the size of Y.

III. AN EXAMPLE OF LOCKING

In this section, we give an explicit example of locking. Compared to previously known constructions [1, 2, 3], it has some additional properties which are needed for our considerations related to cryptography (see Section IV).

In order to formulate our example of locking, we use the following notational conventions: $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3$ are the Pauli matrices on the Hilbert space $\mathbb{C}^2$. For any m-tuple $y = (y_1, \ldots, y_m)$ on $\{1,2,3\}$, we denote by σ_y the m-fold tensor product $\sigma_{y_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \sigma_{y_m}$. Lemma 6 summarises some properties of these operators, which we will use repeatedly in the following.

Let X and Y be random variables on the binary set $\mathcal{X} := \{0,1\}$ and the set of m-tuples $\mathcal{Y} := \{1,2,3\}^m$, respectively, such that the joint probability distribution P_{XY} is uniform. Moreover, for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, let

$$\rho_{E|(X,Y)=(x,y)} := 2^{-m}\big(\mathrm{id}_{(\mathbb{C}^2)^{\otimes m}} + (-1)^x \sigma_y\big) \qquad (3)$$

be an operator on $(\mathbb{C}^2)^{\otimes m}$, representing the state of a quantum system E conditioned on $X=x$ and $Y=y$. It is straightforward to check that this is a consistent description of a $\{ccq\}$-state ρ_{XYE} [25].

Note that for any fixed $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, the conditional quantum states $\rho_{E|(X,Y)=(0,y)}$ and $\rho_{E|(X,Y)=(1,y)}$ are orthogonal. In particular, given access to the quantum system E, the value of X can be determined with certainty if Y is known, that is, we have the following statement.

Lemma 1. *Let ρ_{XYE} be the $\{ccq\}$-state defined above. For any fixed value $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ of the random variable Y, there exists a measurement of the quantum system E with output equal to X.*

On the other hand, if the value of Y is unknown, then any measurement on E reveals almost no information on the pair (X,Y).

Lemma 2. *Let ρ_{XYE} be the $\{ccq\}$-state defined above. Then $I_{\mathrm{acc}}(XY;E) \leq \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^{\frac{m}{2}}$.*

Proof. We show that, for any measurement $\mathcal{M}$ applied to the quantum part E of ρ_{XYE} with outcome Z, the entropy of the pair (X,Y) conditioned on Z is bounded by

$$H(XY|Z) \geq H(XY) - \left(\tfrac{2}{3}\right)^{\frac{m}{2}}\ . \qquad (4)$$

The assertion then follows because $I_{\mathrm{acc}}(XY;E) = H(XY) - \min_{\mathcal{M}} H(XY|Z)$.

Let $\mathcal{N} := \{d \cdot P_{XY}(x,y) \cdot \rho_{E|(X,Y)=(x,y)}\}_{(x,y)\in\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{Y}}$ where $d := 2^m$ is the dimension of E. Because ρ_E is the fully mixed state on E, $\mathcal{N}$ is a POVM on E. By a similar derivation as in [1], it can be shown that

$$H(XY|Z) \geq \min_{\sigma} H(\mathcal{N}[\sigma]) \qquad (5)$$

where the minimum ranges over all states σ on E and $H(\mathcal{N}[\sigma])$ is the entropy of the outcome when the measurement $\mathcal{N}$ is applied to σ (see Lemma 5 in the Appendix).

Using the fact that $\rho_{YE} = \rho_Y \otimes \rho_E$ where ρ_E is the fully mixed state, the term in the minimum of (5) can be rewritten as [26]

$$H(\mathcal{N}[\sigma]) = H(Y) + \mathop{\mathrm{E}}_{y \leftarrow P_Y}[H(\mathcal{N}_y[\sigma])] \tag{6}$$

where, for any $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, $H(\mathcal{N}_y[\sigma])$ is the entropy of the output of the POVM $\mathcal{N}_y := \{d \cdot P_{X|Y=y}(x) \cdot \rho_{E|(X,Y)=(x,y)}\}_{x\in\mathcal{X}}$ applied to σ. Because for every $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ the POVM $\mathcal{N}_y$ is binary-valued, this quantity is easy to bound. More precisely, as the binary entropy function $h(p) := -p\log p - (1-p)\log(1-p)$ satisfies $h(p) \geq 1 - |p-(1-p)|$ for every $p \in [0,1]$ and

$$|\operatorname{tr}(\sigma(\rho_{E|(X,Y)=(0,y)} - \rho_{E|(X,Y)=(1,y)}))| = 2^{-m+1}\operatorname{tr}(\sigma_y\sigma)$$

for every $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ and every state σ on $(\mathbb{C}^2)^{\otimes m}$, we obtain by a straightforward calculation

$$\mathop{\mathrm{E}}_{y \leftarrow P_Y}[H(\mathcal{N}_y[\sigma])] \geq 1 - \frac{1}{|\mathcal{Y}|}\sum_{y\in\mathcal{Y}}\big|\operatorname{tr}(\sigma_y\sigma)\big| \ . \tag{7}$$

Applying the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality gives

$$\frac{1}{|\mathcal{Y}|}\sum_{y\in\mathcal{Y}}\big|\operatorname{tr}(\sigma_y\sigma)\big| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{Y}|}}\sqrt{\sum_{y\in\mathcal{Y}}\operatorname{tr}(\sigma_y\sigma)^2} \leq \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^{\frac{m}{2}} \ , \tag{8}$$

where the last inequality is a consequence of the fact that $\operatorname{tr}(\sigma^2) \leq 1$ for every state σ on $(\mathbb{C}^2)^{\otimes m}$, which implies $\sum_{y\in\mathcal{Y}}\operatorname{tr}(\sigma_y\sigma)^2 \leq 2^m$ [cf. (11)]. Combining (8), (7), (6) with (5) and using the fact that $1 + H(Y) = H(XY)$ implies (4) and thus concludes the proof. □

Because of Lemma 1, we have $I_{\mathrm{acc}}(XY;EY) = H(XY)$. Hence, together with Lemma 2, we conclude that the quantity $\Delta = I_{\mathrm{acc}}(XY;EY) - I_{\mathrm{acc}}(XY;E)$, as defined in Section II, with $V := (X,Y)$, is arbitrarily close to $H(Y)+1$. We thus have a locking effect: The difference Δ is larger than the size of Y.

IV. SMALL ACCESSIBLE INFORMATION DOES NOT IMPLY SECRECY

The locking property of the accessible information has dramatic implications for cryptography. To illustrate this, we consider an n-bit key $S = (S_1,\ldots,S_n)$ together with a quantum system E controlled by an adversary such that, for some bijective mapping f, $\rho_{S_n f(S_1,\ldots,S_{n-1})E} = \rho_{XYE}$ [27], where ρ_{XYE} is the $\{ccq\}$-state as defined in Section III (for $m \approx n/\log_2 3$) [28].

It is an immediate consequence of Lemma 2 that the key S satisfies the security criterion (2′) of Section I, i.e.,

$$I_{\mathrm{acc}}(S;E) = I_{\mathrm{acc}}(XY;E) \leq \varepsilon \ , \tag{9}$$

where $\varepsilon := e^{-\frac{n-2}{8}}$ decreases exponentially fast in the key length n. However, as illustrated by the following example, this is not sufficient for certain applications.

Assume that the key S is used to encrypt an n-bit message $M = (M_1,\ldots,M_n)$ by one-time pad encryption and let $C = (C_1,\ldots,C_n)$ be the corresponding ciphertext. Moreover, assume that an adversary has some a priori knowledge which fully determines the first $n-1$ message bits $M_1,\ldots,M_{n-1}$ [29]. Upon receiving the ciphertext bits $C_1,\ldots,C_{n-1}$, the adversary can thus easily infer the first $n-1$ key bits $S_1,\ldots,S_{n-1}$. Hence, by Lemma 1, she is now in a position to choose an appropriate measurement of her quantum system E which reveals the nth key bit S_n with certainty. The encryption of the nth message bit M_n is thus completely insecure.

V. ALTERNATIVE SECURITY DEFINITION

According to the discussion in the previous section, defining secrecy with respect to the accessible information is problematic in a quantum world. This raises the question whether there are stronger security definitions which, e.g., imply that a secret key can safely be used for one-time pad encryption. As shown recently [4, 5, 6], the answer to this question is positive [30].

Let ρ_{SE} be a $\{cq\}$-state describing a classical key S together with the quantum knowledge of an adversary, i.e., $\rho_{SE} := \sum_{s\in\mathcal{S}} P_S(s)|s\rangle\langle s| \otimes \rho_{E|S=s}$ where $\{|s\rangle\}_{s\in\mathcal{S}}$ are orthonormal states representing the value of S.

Definition 3 ([5, 6]). *A random variable S on $\mathcal{S}$ is called an ε-secure key with respect to E if [31]*

$$\big\|\rho_{SE} - \rho_U \otimes \rho_E\big\| \leq \varepsilon \ ,$$

where $\rho_U := \sum_{s\in\mathcal{S}} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|}|s\rangle\langle s|$ is the completely mixed state.

As discussed in [5], ε-security has an intuitive interpretation: With probability $1-\varepsilon$, the key S can be considered identical to a perfectly secure key U, i.e., U is uniformly distributed and independent of the adversary's information. In other words, Definition 3 guarantees that the key S is perfectly secure except with probability ε. Clearly, this is still true if S is used in any application.

Interestingly, this strong type of security can be achieved quite easily. For example, it has been shown [5] that the key computed by applying a two-universal hash function to a random string with sufficient entropy satisfies Definition 3 [32]. Security proofs of QKD which are based on this result (see, e.g., [7]) are thus not affected by the problem discussed above.

The following lemma shows that strongly secure keys can also be obtained by measuring predistributed Bell

states $|\Phi^+\rangle$ (or approximations thereof). It follows from this statement that security proofs based on entanglement purification (where the entanglement is usually measured in terms of the fidelity to a fully entangled state, as, e.g., in [8, 9]) can easily be adapted to meet Definition 3 [33] (see also [4]).

Lemma 4. *Let $\varepsilon \geq 0$ and let ρ_{AB} be a bipartite quantum state such that $F(\rho_{AB}, |\Phi^+\rangle^{\otimes n}) \geq \sqrt{1-\varepsilon^2}$. Then the two n-bit strings resulting from local measurements of ρ_{AB} in the computational basis are ε-secure keys (with respect to an adversary holding a purification of ρ_{AB}).*

Proof. According to Uhlmann's theorem, there exists a pure state $|\kappa\rangle$ and a purification $|\Theta\rangle$ of ρ_{AB} with some auxiliary system E such that

$$F(|\Theta\rangle, |\Phi^+\rangle^{\otimes n} \otimes |\kappa\rangle) = F(\rho_{AB}, |\Phi^+\rangle^{\otimes n}) \ .$$

Using the relation $\|\rho - \sigma\| \leq \sqrt{1 - F(\rho,\sigma)^2}$ and the assumption of the lemma, we find

$$\left\| |\Theta\rangle\langle\Theta| - (|\Phi^+\rangle\langle\Phi^+| \otimes |\kappa\rangle\langle\kappa|)^{\otimes n} \right\| \leq \varepsilon \ .$$

Let $\rho_{S_A S_B E}$ be the $\{ccq\}$-state describing the situation after measuring $|\Theta\rangle$ with respect to the computational basis in A and B. Because the trace distance can only decrease under physical operations, we conclude

$$\left\| \rho_{S_A S_B E} - \rho_{UU} \otimes \sigma_E \right\| \leq \varepsilon \ ,$$

where $\rho_{UU} = \sum_{s \in \{0,1\}^n} \frac{1}{2^n} |s\rangle\langle s| \otimes |s\rangle\langle s|$. □

VI. CONCLUSIONS

The setting considered in this paper consists of a classical n-bit string $S = (S_1, \ldots, S_n)$ (for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$) and a quantum system E such that the following holds: (i) any measurement on E chosen independently of S only reveals a negligible amount of information about S (i.e., $I_{\mathrm{acc}}(S;E)$ is exponentially small in n) and (ii) given the first $n-1$ bits of S, there exists a measurement on E which determines the value of the nth bit with certainty (i.e., $I_{\mathrm{acc}}(S; ES_1, \ldots, S_{n-1}) = n$).

This example of locking reveals a weakness of security definitions based on the accessible information as they are used in the standard literature on quantum cryptography. In particular, a secret key which is secure according to such a definition might become completely insecure when it is used in certain applications (Section IV). A possible solution to this problem is to use the stronger yet still achievable notion of ε-security (Section V): An ε-secure key can safely be used in any application—except with some (arbitrarily small) probability ε.

Acknowledgments

Large parts of the work presented in this paper has been carried out while the authors were with the Information Security and Cryptography Research group of the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology (ETH) Zurich, Switzerland. This research is partially funded by project PROSECCO of the IST-FET programme of the EC and by Hewlett Packard.

APPENDIX

Let ρ_{VE} be a $\{cq\}$-state. Lemma 5 gives a lower bound on the entropy of V conditioned on the outcome of any measurement on E.

Lemma 5. *Let ρ_{VE} be a $\{cq\}$-state with the property that ρ_E is the completely mixed state on E. For some fixed POVM $\mathcal{M}$ applied to E, let $H(V|Z)$ be the entropy of V conditioned on the outcome Z. Then*

$$H(V|Z) \geq \min_{\sigma} H(\mathcal{N}[\sigma])$$

where σ ranges over all states on E and $H(\mathcal{N}[\sigma])$ denotes the entropy of the outcome when the POVM $\mathcal{N} := \{\dim(E) \cdot P_V(v) \cdot \rho_{E|V=v}\}_{v \in \mathcal{V}}$ is applied to σ.

Proof. The fact that ρ_E is the completely mixed state on E implies that $\mathcal{N}$ is a POVM. The same fact also implies that the measurement result Z is distributed according to $P_Z(z) = \frac{\mathrm{tr}(M_z)}{d}$ for every outcome z, where $d := \dim(E)$ and M_z are the operators of the POVM $\mathcal{M}$. This in turn gives

$$P_{V|Z}(v|z) = \frac{P_V(v) \cdot P_{Z|V}(z|v)}{P_Z(z)} = \frac{\mathrm{tr}(M_z \rho_{E|V=v})}{\mathrm{tr}(M_z)} \cdot d \cdot P_V(v) \ .$$

Hence

$$H(V|Z) \geq \min_z H(V|Z=z) \ \geq \min_{\tilde{\sigma}} H(P_Z^{\tilde{\sigma}}) \ , \qquad (10)$$

where the minimum is over all non-zero operators $\tilde{\sigma}$ on E with $0 \leq \tilde{\sigma} \leq \mathrm{id}_E$ and $P_V^{\tilde{\sigma}}$ is the distribution

$$P_V^{\tilde{\sigma}}(v) := \frac{\mathrm{tr}(\tilde{\sigma}\rho_{E|V=v})}{\mathrm{tr}(\tilde{\sigma})} \cdot d \cdot P_V(v) \ .$$

Note that for such an operator $\tilde{\sigma}$, the operator $\sigma := \frac{\tilde{\sigma}}{\mathrm{tr}(\tilde{\sigma})}$ is a state on E. The assertion thus follows from (10) and the observation that $\mathcal{N}[\sigma] \equiv P_V^{\tilde{\sigma}}$. □

The next lemma summarises some properties of tensor products of Pauli operators. As in Section III, for any m-tuple $y = (y_1, \ldots, y_m)$ on $\{0,1,2,3\}$, σ_y denotes the m-fold tensor product $\sigma_{y_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \sigma_{y_m}$ of Pauli operators.

Lemma 6. *The following holds for all m-tuples $y, y' \in \{0,1,2,3\}^m$.*

(i) $\sigma_y^\dagger = \sigma_y$

(ii) $\mathrm{tr}(\sigma_y) = 2^m \cdot \delta_{y,0}$.

(iii) The eigenvalues of σ_y are $\{-1, 1\}$.

(iv) $\mathrm{tr}(\sigma_y^\dagger \sigma_{y'}) = 2^m \cdot \delta_{y,y'}$.

Lemma 6 implies that the operators $\{2^{-\frac{m}{2}} \cdot \sigma_y\}_{y\in\{0,1,2,3\}^m}$ form an orthonormal basis of the space of hermitian operators on $(\mathbb{C}^2)^{\otimes m}$ with respect to the Hilbert-Schmidt scalar product $\langle A, B\rangle := \mathrm{tr}(A^\dagger B)$. In particular, every state σ on $(\mathbb{C}^2)^{\otimes m}$ can be written in the so-called generalised Bloch representation as

$$\sigma = 2^{-m} \sum_{y\in\{0,1,2,3\}^m} \mathrm{tr}(\sigma_y \sigma)\sigma_y \ , \tag{11}$$

where the coefficients $\mathrm{tr}(\sigma_y\sigma)$ are real-valued.

---

[1] D. P. DiVincenzo, M. Horodecki, D. W. Leung, J. A. Smolin, and B. M. Terhal, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 067902 (2004).

[2] H. Buhrman, M. Christandl, P. Hayden, H.-W. Lo, and S. Wehner (2005), eprint: quant-ph/0504078.

[3] P. Hayden, D. Leung, P. W. Shor, and A. Winter, Comm. Math. Phys. **250**, 371 (2004).

[4] M. Ben-Or, M. Horodecki, D. W. Leung, D. Mayers, and J. Oppenheim, in *Second Theory of Cryptography Conference, TCC 2005* (2005), vol. 3378, pp. 386–406.

[5] R. Renner and R. König, in *Second Theory of Cryptography Conference, TCC 2005* (2005), vol. 3378, pp. 407–425.

[6] R. Renner, Ph.D. thesis, ETH Zürich (2005).

[7] B. Kraus, N. Gisin, and R. Renner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 080501 (2005).

[8] H.-K. Lo and H. F. Chau, Science **283**, 2050 (1999).

[9] P. Shor and J. Preskill, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85** (2000).

[10] G. S. Vernam, J. Am. Inst. Elec. Eng. **55** (1926).

[11] U. M. Maurer, IEEE Transactions on Information Theory **39**, 733 (1993).

[12] A. D. Wyner, Bell System Technical Journal **54** (1975).

[13] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, and J.-M. Robert, SIAM Journal on Computing **17**, 210 (1988).

[14] I. Csiszár and J. Körner, IEEE Transactions on Information Theory **24**, 339 (1978).

[15] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum computation and quantum information* (Cambridge University Press, 2000).

[16] D. Gottesman and H.-K. Lo, IEEE Transactions on Information Theory **49**, 457 (2003).

[17] H.-K. Lo, H. F. Chau, and M. Ardehali, Journal of Cryptology **18**, 133 (2005).

[18] In a *one-time pad* encryption scheme [10], a string M of message bits is encrypted with a key S of the same length. The ciphertext C is given by bitwise addition (modulo 2) of M and S.

[19] For an introduction to classical information-theoretic key agreement, see, e.g., [11].

[20] See, e.g., [11, 12, 13, 14].

[21] See, e.g., [8, 9, 15, 16, 17] and also the discussion in [4] and [5].

[22] In the literature, the accessible information is often defined in terms of ensembles. It is easy to verify that such a definition is equivalent to the one given here.

[23] $I_{\mathrm{acc}}(V;YE)$ denotes the accessible information of the $\{cq\}$-state $\rho_{V(YE)}$ which is obtained from ρ_{VYE} by combining the systems Y and E.

[24] $I(V;Y|Z) := H(V|Z) + H(Y|Z) - H(VY|Z)$ is the mutual information between V and Y given Z.

[25] An alternative description of the state ρ_{XYE} which clarifies the relation to the locking construction of [1] is the following. For $y \in \{1,2,3\}$, let $\{[0]_y, [1]_y\}$ denote the projectors onto the eigenspaces of σ_y. Let R and Y be independent and uniformly distributed random variables on $\mathcal{R} := \{0,1\}^m$ and $\mathcal{Y}$, respectively. For $r \in \mathcal{R}$ and $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, let

$$\rho_{E|(R,Y)=(r,y)} := [r_1]_{y_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes [r_m]_{y_m} \ .$$

Finally, let X be the random variable on $\mathcal{X}$ defined by $X := \oplus_{i=1}^m R_i$, where $\oplus$ denotes addition modulo 2. It is then straightforward to check that the resulting conditional states $\rho_{E|(X,Y)=(x,y)}$ are given by (3).

[26] $E_{y\leftarrow P_Y}[\cdot]$ denotes the expectation over the values y chosen according to the distribution P_Y.

[27] That is, $X = S_n$ and $Y = f(S_1, \ldots, S_{n-1})$.

[28] As we will consider one-time pad encryption with the key S, we assume for simplicity that S is a bitstring. Because the cardinality of the range of (X,Y) (i.e., $\{0,1\} \times \{1,2,3\}^m$) and S (i.e., $\{0,1\}^n$) do not match, S is not perfectly uniformly distributed on the key space. However, a qualitatively identical statement with a perfectly uniformly distributed key can be obtained by using an appropriate adaption of the one-time pad to keys and messages on the space $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} = \{0,1\} \times \{1,2,3\}^m$.

[29] For example, the first $n-1$ bits of the message might be some redundant header information.

[30] It has been shown in [4] that a key S is secure in a strong sense if (9) holds for a security parameter ε which is exponentially small in the key size. Our example shows that this exponential dependence is in fact necessary, thus answering an open question in [4]. Note, however, that making the security parameter ε in (9) exponentially small comes at the cost of reducing the key rate substantially.

[31] For two states ρ and σ, $\|\rho - \sigma\| := 1/2\, \mathrm{tr}\, |\rho - \sigma|$ denotes the *trace distance* between ρ and σ.

[32] We refer to [5] and [6] for a detailed description of privacy amplification in the context of quantum adversaries.

[33] These security proofs usually make use of a similar relation between the fidelity and the accessible information (see, e.g., Lemma 1 and 2 given in the supplementary material of [8] and the discussion in Footnote 28 of [8]). Substituting this relation by Lemma 4 thus turns these arguments into proofs of security according to the stronger criterion (Definition 3) given above.